

1 EDMUND G. BROWN JR.  
2 Attorney General of the State of California  
3 DANE R. GILLETTE  
4 Chief Assistant Attorney General  
5 GARY W. SCHONS  
6 Senior Assistant Attorney General  
7 LILIA E. GARCIA  
8 Supervising Deputy Attorney General  
9 ELIZABETH S. VOORHIES, State Bar No. 183172  
Deputy Attorney General  
110 West A Street, Suite 1100  
San Diego, CA 92101  
P.O. Box 85266  
San Diego, CA 92186-5266  
Telephone: (619) 645-3080  
Fax: (619) 645-2191  
Email: Elizabeth.Voorhies@doj.ca.gov

## 10 | Attorneys for Respondent

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

14 || MARK McLEAN SAUNDERS.

Petitioner,

V.

17 V. M. ALMAGER, Warden,

## Respondent.

08CV0757 L (AJB)

**RESPONDENT'S OPPOSITION  
TO PETITIONER'S MOTION  
TO STAY FEDERAL  
PROCEEDINGS PENDING  
EXHAUSTION OF STATE  
COURT REMEDIES**

Honorable Anthony J. Battaglia

On April 25, 2008, Petitioner Saunders filed the pending Petition containing two purportedly exhausted federal constitutional claims and simultaneously moved this Court to stay the instant proceedings while he exhausts three other constitutional claims which are currently before the California state courts. Respectfully, Respondent opposes Saunders' motion for stay.

In *Rhines v. Weber*, 544 U.S. 269, 273-74, 125 S. Ct. 1528, 161 L. Ed. 2d 440 (2005), the United States Supreme Court cautioned that in order to meet the twin purposes of AEDPA’s exhaustion and statute of limitations requirement, the “stay and abeyance should be available only in limited circumstances.” *Id.* at 1535. As a threshold matter, stay and abeyance “is only appropriate

1 when the district court determines there was good cause for the petitioner's failure to exhaust his  
2 claims first in state court." *Id.*

3       *Rhines* presented a unique factual scenario: The petitioner filed one round of state  
4 collateral review before filing a federal petition. At the time the petition was filed there were 11  
5 months remaining in the limitations period, but 18 months elapsed before the district court found  
6 that eight of the 35 claims were unexhausted. Because the statute of limitations period would have  
7 prevented the petitioner from filing another federal petition, the district court chose not to dismiss  
8 the petition but instead held it in abeyance for petitioner to pursue his state court remedies as to the  
9 unexhausted claims. *Id.* at 1532.

10       The facts of the instant case are wholly dissimilar to those present in *Rhines*. Although  
11 the statute of limitations in this case began to run on or about August 9, 2007, Saunders is entitled  
12 to statutory tolling of the one-year limitations period from February 28, 2008 -- i.e., the filing date  
13 of his first collateral state remedy -- through the date the California Supreme Court denies the state  
14 habeas petition which is currently pending at the superior court level. Accordingly, in contrast to  
15 the petitioner in *Rhines*, Saunders still has a reasonable opportunity -- i.e., a time frame of  
16 approximately five months -- to pursue his state court remedies as to all constitutional claims he  
17 wishes to bring to federal court.

18       Moreover, whereas in *Rhines* the petitioner commenced pursuit of his state court remedies  
19 a mere one month into the limitations period, Saunders do so after almost seven months had elapsed

20       ///

21       ///

22       ///

23       ///

24       ///

25       ///

26       ///

27       ///

28       ///

1 -- and at that time raised challenges to the application of the Three Strikes law which were known  
2 to him, and thus could have been raised, at any time during the preceding two-year time frame  
3 within which his case was pending on direct appeal.

4 For these reasons, Saunders has failed to demonstrate good cause to stay the instant federal  
5 proceedings.

6 Dated: June 19, 2008

7 Respectfully submitted,

8 EDMUND G. BROWN JR.  
Attorney General of the State of California

9 DANE R. GILLETTE  
Chief Assistant Attorney General

10 GARY W. SCHONS  
Senior Assistant Attorney General

11 LILIA E. GARCIA  
Supervising Deputy Attorney General

12  
13  
14 s/Elizabeth S. Voorhies

15  
16 ELIZABETH S. VOORHIES  
17 Deputy Attorney General  
Attorneys for Respondent

18 ESV:cjm

19 80251678.wpd

SD2008801234

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY U.S. MAIL**

**Case Name:** Saunders v. Almager

No.: 08CV0757 L (AJB)

I declare:

I am employed in the Office of the Attorney General, which is the office of a member of the California State Bar, at which member's direction this service is made. I am 18 years of age or older and not a party to this matter. I am familiar with the business practice at the Office of the Attorney General for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. In accordance with that practice, correspondence placed in the internal mail collection system at the Office of the Attorney General is deposited with the United States Postal Service that same day in the ordinary course of business.

On June 20, 2008, I served the following documents:

**RESPONDENT'S OPPOSITION TO PETITIONER'S MOTION TO  
STAY FEDERAL PROCEEDINGS PENDING EXHAUSTION OF  
STATE COURT REMEDIES**

by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the internal mail collection system at the Office of the Attorney General at 110 West A Street, Suite 1100, P.O. Box 85266, San Diego, CA 92186-5266, addressed as follows:

## **Electronic Mail Notice List**

I have caused the above-mentioned document(s) to be electronically served on the following person(s), who are currently on the list to receive e-mail notices for this case:

None

## **Manual Notice List**

The following are those who are **not** on the list to receive e-mail notices for this case (who therefore require manual noticing):

Mark McLean Saunders  
CDC # F-02744  
Centinela State Prison  
P.O. Box 931  
Imperial, CA 92251  
In Pro Se

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on June 20, 2008, at San Diego, California.

J. Evans

## Declarant

J. Evans  
Signature

### Signature

SD2008801234

80251745.wpd